

## CONSUMERS' SATISFACTION TOWARDS VARIOUS PRODUCT ATTRIBUTES OF COMPACT CARS AND THE PROBLEMS FACED BY THE CONSUMERS AFTER PURCHASE – A STUDY WITH REFERENCE TO COIMBATORE CITY

V. RANGANATHAN<sup>1</sup> & K. MANGAIYARKKARAS<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Arignar Anna Government Arts College Cheyyar, India

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, PG & Research Department of Commerce with Computer Applications, Hindusthan College of Arts & Science, Coimbatore, India

### ABSTRACT

*Consumer satisfaction among different Multi brand car service center has become an important and necessary concept in today's service business world. Due to the importance of repeat business, it is vital for service businesses to focus on long term relationship with the customer. The wide range of models from different manufacturers with not much change in the specifications within the same price band has made it easy for customers to switch from one brand to another. So the challenge of attracting the customers, selling and retaining them with world class services has turned out to be a great challenge for all the automobile manufacturers. This study draws a detailed analysis on the consumers' level of satisfaction and the problems faced by them with the compact car brought by them. The study has been conducted in Coimbatore City for which a sample size of 720 is chosen.*

**KEYWORDS:** Customer Satisfaction, Automobile Manufacturers, Compact Car

Received: May 31 2017; Accepted: Jun 21 2017; Published: Jun 29 2017; Paper Id.: IJSMMRDAUG20172

### INTRODUCTION

Right from the very first launching of the small-car in the Indian market the small-car segment had always been the high and fast growth segment of the Indian automobile market. Increase in the number of car consumers and heavy usage is influenced by many factors such as increasing per capita income, several small car model availabilities and so on. The huge growth potential for small car manufacturers, as both domestic and international manufacturers are presented with great challenges and opportunities in the near future. The study of consumer satisfaction is one of the most interesting areas because it is concerned with understanding consumer with regard to why individual act in certain consumption in a related ways.

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A study conducted in the past has found that India's dealership environment gets high marks for attractive store layouts, but other dimensions have low rankings. Moreover, most dealerships only make a basic assessment of buyer needs, with product presentation usually driven by customers' stated interest rather than a concerted, structured approach to drawing buyers to certain products. Knowledge of competitive products also tends to be limited. Because of the poor operational efficiency of dealers, the consumers may face certain issues and problems when they avail dealers' services; this study focuses its discussion on these issues.

## SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Any marketer's success depends on how they are ultimately satisfying their consumers. It is hugely influenced by the factors such as how they are making their customers aware of their products, how they present their products to them and the foremost important aspect is how they satisfy their customers during all stages of purchasing the product. Even still, there is a necessity for all marketers to satisfy their customers at post purchase stage, which is a key to retain them. Hence there is a remarkable scope in studying how compact car consumers are satisfied with their product and it has a crucial impact if it is known what are the problems they experienced by their products and the problems faced during after sales service at the dealers' point.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the satisfaction level of consumers on the various product attributes of compact cars.
- To know the various problems faced by the consumers by the use of their cars.
- To identify the nature of problems experienced by the consumers during after sales service at the dealers point.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

The data for the study has been collected from Coimbatore city on convenience sampling method. A field survey was conducted to collect the primary data from 720 respondents through the Questionnaire method with a set of predetermined questions. The respondents of this study are the users of various compact brand cars such as Santro, i20, Eon, Grand i10, Wagon R, Swift, Alto 800, Zen, Suzuki A-Star, Ritz, Punto Evo, Palio, Jazz, Brio, Amaze, Indica, Vista, Figo, Polo, Micra, Etios Liva, Vibe and Pulse.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Sridevi (2013)** in her study on "Consumer Satisfaction of Hyundai Car Users with Special Reference to Coimbatore City" found that road transport plays a very important role in this modern world, in which car has attracted many people because of its various added advantages and technologies, such as they had given more importance to small size cars for personal use. The consumers also got satisfied regarding the performance, good looking, resale value, vehicle design and safety of the Hyundai cars and maintaining their car by private mechanics, they are ready to recommend it to others also.

**Mahapatra and et al (2010)** made a study on "Customer satisfaction, dissatisfaction and post purchase evaluation: an empirical study on small size passenger cars in India". The main objectives of their study were to examine the satisfaction and impact on future purchase decision and explore the performance of different attributes in automobile in giving satisfaction to customers. The major findings of their study were that customers are highly satisfied with the performance of attributes like pickups, wipers, etc. and other attributes like pollution, engine, quietness, battery performance, and pick up influence the consumer future purchase decisions and consumer give more importance to these factors.

**Rajnish Katarne and et al (2010)** made a study to measure the current service quality level of a typical automobile dealership in an Indian city. In their study, satisfaction/dissatisfaction of the customer has been measured using standard statistical tools, and an attempt has been made to find out reason(s) for dissatisfaction. They found that the current performance of a service center was not found up to the mark.

**Table 1: Personal Profile of the Respondents**

Sl. No	Particulars		No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Gender	Male	522	72.50
		Female	198	27.50
		<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>
2	Age	17-30 Years	425	59.03
		31-40 Years	180	25.00
		41-50 Years	77	10.69
		51-60 Years	29	4.03
		61-70 Above	9	1.25
		<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>
3	Educational Qualification	School Education	136	18.89
		Collegiate education	519	72.08
		Illiterate	65	9.03
		<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>
4	Occupational Status	Business / Profession	274	38.06
		Government Employee	109	15.14
		Private Employee	253	35.14
		Agriculture	74	10.28
		Others	10	1.39
		<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary data

From the above table it is evident that from the sample size 720, 72.50 % of the respondents are male and 27.50% of the respondents are female and 59.03% of the respondents are in the age group of 17- 30 years, 25% of the respondents are in the age group of 31-40 years, 10.69% of the respondents are in the age group of 41-50 years and 4.03% of the respondents are in the age group of 51-60 years and 1.25 % of the respondents are in the age group of 60 years and above, 18.89% of the respondents have school education, 72.08% of the respondents have collegiate education, and 9.03% of the respondents are illiterate, 38.06% of the respondents are professionals or doing their own business, 35.14% are private employees, 15.14% are government employee, 10.28% are agriculturist 1.39 % are students and house wives and others.

It can be inferred that majority (72.50%) of the respondents are male, majority (59.03%) of the respondents are in the age group of 17- 30 years, and majority (72.08%) of the respondents are having Collegiate Education and most (38.06%) of the respondents are professionals or doing their own business.

**Table 2: Customers Level of Satisfaction Towards Products Attributes and the Product Performance**

Particulars	Highly Satisfaction	Satisfaction	Neutral	Dis Satisfaction	Highly Dissatisfaction	Sum	Mean	Rank
Price	294 (40.83)	299 (41.53)	114 (15.83)	13 (1.81)	0 (0.00)	3034	4.21	4
Quality(Durability, Reliability)	243 (33.75)	402 (55.83)	64 (8.89)	10 (1.39)	1 (0.14)	3036	4.22	3
Driving Comfort	246 (34.17)	319 (44.31)	151 (20.97)	4 (0.56)	0 (0.00)	2967	4.12	8
Safety and Enjoyment	277 (38.47)	287 (39.86)	124 (17.22)	32 (4.44)	0 (0.00)	2969	4.12	8
Interior(Exotic colours, legroom, seat design, arm rest, music system)	244 (33.89)	337 (46.81)	114 (15.83)	16 (2.22)	9 (1.25)	2951	4.10	10
Space	258 (35.83)	349 (48.47)	105 (14.58)	8 (1.11)	0 (0.00)	3017	4.19	6
Technology	269 (37.36)	336 (46.67)	102 (14.17)	13 (1.81)	0 (0.00)	3021	4.20	5
Exterior( Overall	261 (36.25)	347 (48.19)	102 (14.17)	10 (1.39)	0 (0.00)	3019	4.19	6

look, colour, shape, etc)								
Fuel Efficiency	300 (41.67)	312 (43.33)	98 (13.61)	10 (1.39)	0 (0.00)	3062	4.25	2
Vehicle Performance(Pickup, mileage, acceleration, max speed, torque, Engine Capacity)	334 (46.39)	316 (43.89)	59 (8.19)	10 (1.39)	1 (0.14)	3132	4.35	1

Source: Primary Data

From the above table discussion it has been observed that consumers' level of satisfaction towards vehicle performance is ranked in first place with the mean score of 4.35. Followed by the respondents' have said that they were satisfied with the: fuel efficiency feature of compact cars. This variable is ranked in second place with the mean score of 4.25. Similarly the buyers have started that they brought a brand of cars by influenced by the features like: quality, price, technology, exterior design and space of product attributes in brand of cars. These variables is ranked in third, fourth, fifth and sixth place with the mean score of 4.22, 4.21, 4.20 and 4.19 respectively. Batch of consumers have said that they were attracted by the product attributes in brand of cars like: driving comfort, safety and enjoyment and interior product. These variables are ranked in eighth to tenth place with the mean score 4.12 and 4.10 respectively.

Thus it has been clearly concluded that majority of consumers were found to be satisfied with the vehicle performance.

#### H1: Consumers level of satisfaction towards product attributes varies from one brand of cars to others

**Table 3(a): Paired T Test Consumers Level of Satisfaction Towards Product Attributes of Brand Car**

Brand Name	Level of Satisfaction									
	Price		Quality(Durability, Reliability)		Driving Comfort		Safety and Enjoyment		Interior(Exotic Colours, Legroom, Seat Design, Arm Rest, Music System)	
	1.793 (Mean)	0.750 (SD)	1.783 (Mean)	0.669 (SD)	1.879 (Mean)	0.748 (SD)	1.876 (Mean)	0.849 (SD)	1.901 (Mean)	0.831 (SD)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Hyundai	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710
Maruti	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669
Fiat	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993
Honda	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937
Ford	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971
Volkswagen	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003
Tata	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967
Chevrolet	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129
Nissan	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127
Toyota	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089
Mahindra	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094
Renault	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

Table 3(b): Paired T Test Consumers Level of Satisfaction Towards Product Attributes of Brand Car

Brand Name	Level of Satisfaction									
	Space		Technology		Exterior( Overall Look, colour, Shape, etc)		Fuel Efficiency		Vehicle Performance(Pickup, Mileage, Acceleration, Max Speed, Torque, Engine Capacity)	
	1.810 (Mean)	0.716 (SD)	1.804 (Mean)	0.712 (SD)	1.807 (Mean)	0.723 (SD)	1.747 (Mean)	0.738 (SD)	1.650 (Mean)	0.701 (SD)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Hyundai	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710	1.860	0.710
Maruti	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669	1.808	0.669
Fiat	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993	2.103	0.993
Honda	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937	1.933	0.937
Ford	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971	1.843	0.971
Volkswagen	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003	1.825	1.003
Tata	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967	2.131	0.967
Chevrolet	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129	2.063	1.129
Nissan	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127	2.057	1.127
Toyota	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089	1.951	1.089
Mahindra	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094	1.961	1.094
Renault	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055	1.860	1.055

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

Table 4(a): Paired T Test Consumers Level of Satisfaction Towards Product Attributes of Brand Car

Brand Name	Level of Satisfaction														
	Price			Quality(Durability, Reliability)			Driving Comfort			Safety and Enjoyment			Interior(Exotic colours, Legroom,Seat Design, Arm Rest, Music System)		
	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	T	Sig
Hyundai	-0.067	-1.799	.072	-0.076	-2.070	.039	0.019	0.535	.593	0.017	0.408	.684	0.042	1.081	.280
Maruti	-0.015	-0.426	.670	-0.025	-0.706	.481	0.071	1.947	.052	0.068	1.727	.085	0.093	2.421	.016
Fiat	-0.310	-6.738	.000	-0.319	-7.167	.000	-0.224	-4.889	.000	-0.226	-4.770	.000	-0.201	-4.307	.000
Honda	-0.140	-3.236	.001	-0.150	-3.520	.000	-0.054	-1.208	.227	-0.057	-1.214	.225	-0.032	-0.706	.481
Ford	-0.050	-1.089	.277	-0.060	-1.343	.180	0.036	0.779	.436	0.033	0.687	.492	0.058	1.212	.226
Volkswagen	-0.032	-0.689	.491	-0.042	-0.923	.356	0.054	1.147	.252	0.051	1.061	.289	0.076	1.583	.114
Tata	-0.338	-7.577	.000	-0.347	-8.205	.000	-0.251	-5.670	.000	-0.254	-5.518	.000	-0.229	-5.066	.000
Chevrolet	-0.269	-5.432	.000	-0.279	-5.739	.000	-0.183	-3.684	.000	-0.186	-3.575	.000	-0.161	-3.114	.002
Nissan	-0.264	-5.130	.000	-0.274	-5.657	.000	-0.178	-3.610	.000	-0.181	-3.530	.000	-0.156	-3.052	.002
Toyota	-0.158	-3.155	.002	-0.168	-3.481	.001	-0.072	-1.476	.141	-0.075	-1.456	.146	-0.050	-1.013	.312
Mahindra	-0.168	-3.387	.001	-0.178	-3.663	.000	-0.082	-1.691	.091	-0.085	-1.647	.100	-0.060	-1.207	.228
Renault	-0.067	-1.342	.180	-0.076	-1.645	.100	0.019	0.411	.681	0.017	0.334	.738	0.042	0.849	.396

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

Table 4(b): Paired T Test Consumers Level of Satisfaction Towards Product Attributes of Brand Car

Brand Name	Level of Satisfaction														
	Space			Technology			Exterior( Overall look, colour, shape, etc)			Fuel Efficiency			Vehicle Performance(Pickup, mileage, acceleration, max speed, torque, Engine Capacity)		
	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	t	Sig	Mean	T	Sig	Mean	t	Sig	Mean	T	Sig
Hyundai	-0.050	-1.346	.179	-0.056	-1.531	.126	-0.053	-1.417	.157	-0.113	-2.976	.003	-0.210	-5.781	.000
Maruti	0.001	0.039	.969	-0.004	-0.114	.909	-0.001	-0.038	.970	-0.061	-1.644	.101	-0.158	-4.605	.000
Fiat	-0.293	-6.425	.000	-0.299	-6.609	.000	-0.296	-6.607	.000	-0.356	-7.614	.000	-0.453	-10.545	.000
Honda	-0.124	-2.769	.006	-0.129	-2.995	.003	-0.126	-2.909	.004	-0.186	-4.170	.000	-0.283	-6.810	.000
Ford	-0.033	-0.738	.461	-0.039	-0.862	.389	-0.036	-0.794	.428	-0.096	-2.081	.038	-0.193	-4.388	.000
Volkswagen	-0.015	-0.326	.745	-0.021	-0.448	.654	-0.018	-0.393	.695	-0.078	-1.653	.099	-0.175	-3.927	.000
Tata	-0.321	-7.246	.000	-0.326	-7.260	.000	-0.324	-7.263	.000	-0.383	-8.330	.000	-0.481	-11.291	.000
Chevrolet	-0.253	-5.037	.000	-0.258	-5.249	.000	-0.256	-5.117	.000	-0.315	-6.203	.000	-0.413	-8.420	.000
Nissan	-0.247	-4.949	.000	-0.253	-5.203	.000	-0.250	-5.086	.000	-0.310	-6.181	.000	-0.407	-8.363	.000
Toyota	-0.142	-2.926	.004	-0.147	-3.047	.002	-0.144	-3.061	.002	-0.204	-4.201	.000	-0.301	-6.352	.000
Mahindra	-0.151	-3.039	.002	-0.157	-3.231	.001	-0.154	-3.176	.002	-0.214	-4.351	.000	-0.311	-6.527	.000
Renault	-0.050	-1.040	.299	-0.056	-1.171	.242	-0.053	-1.126	.261	-0.113	-2.391	.017	-0.210	-4.490	.000

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

From the above table it has been inferred that probability value of 't' value is observed to be significant at five per cent. Therefore the hypothesis framed stands accepted and it is concluded that consumers' level of satisfaction towards product attributes varies from one brand of cars to others.

**Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test Level of Satisfaction Towards Products**

<b>Attributes and the Dealer Performance</b>	
<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</b>	<b>.801</b>
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square	1306.962
DF	45
Sig	.000

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

In the present study, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity were applied to verify the adequacy or appropriateness of data for factor analysis. In this study, the value of KMO for overall matrix was found to be excellent (0.801) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity was highly significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). Bartlett's Sphericity test was effective, as the chi-square value draws significance at five per cent level. The results thus indicated that the sample taken was appropriate to proceed with a factor analysis procedure. Besides the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the KMO Measure of sampling Adequacy, Communalities values of all variables were also observed.

**Table 6: Cumulative Level of Satisfaction Towards Products Attributes and the Dealer Performance**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Extraction</b>
Price	1.000	.821
Quality(Durability, Reliability)	1.000	.680
Driving Comfort	1.000	.590
Safety and enjoyment	1.000	.713
Interior(Exotic colours, legroom, seat design, arm rest, music system)	1.000	.725
Space	1.000	.780
Technology	1.000	.611
Exterior( Overall look, colour, shape, etc)	1.000	.661
Fuel Efficiency	1.000	.890
Vehicle Performance(Pickup, mileage, acceleration, max speed, torque, Engine Capacity)	1.000	.706

In order to provide a more parsimonious interpretation of the results, 10-item scale was then Factor analyzed using the Principal Component method with Varimax rotation.

**Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix Level of Satisfaction Towards Products Attributes and the Dealer Performance**

Variables	Level of Satisfaction				
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied
X <sub>1</sub> -Price	-	-	-	.888	-
X <sub>2</sub> - Quality(Durability, Reliability)	-	-	-	.674	-
X <sub>3</sub> - Driving Comfort	.642	-	-	-	-
X <sub>4</sub> - Safety and enjoyment	.765	-	-	-	-
X <sub>5</sub> - Interior(Exotic colours, legroom, seat design, arm rest, music system)	.735	-	-	-	-
X <sub>6</sub> - Space	-	-	.856	-	-
X <sub>7</sub> - Technology	-	-	.639	-	-
X <sub>8</sub> - Exterior( Overall look, colour, shape, etc)	-	.736	-	-	-
X <sub>9</sub> - Fuel Efficiency	-	-	-	-	.901
X <sub>10</sub> - Vehicle Performance(Pickup, mileage, acceleration, max speed, torque, Engine Capacity)	-	.810	-	-	-
<b>Eigen value</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.77</b>
<b>% of Variance</b>	<b>32.29</b>	<b>11.74</b>	<b>10.60</b>	<b>9.42</b>	<b>7.72</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>32.29</b>	<b>44.04</b>	<b>54.64</b>	<b>64.05</b>	<b>71.77</b>

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

Five factors extracted together account for 71.77 percent of the total variance (information contained in the original 10 variables). This is pretty good, because we are able to economize on the number of variables (from 10 researcher have reduced them to five underlying factors), while the data lost only about 29 percent of the information content (71 percent is retained by the five factors extracted out of the 10 original variables).

Five factors were identified as being maximum percentage variance accounted. The variables X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub> and X<sub>5</sub> are grouped as factor I and it accounts for 32.29 per cent of the total variance. The variables X<sub>8</sub> and X<sub>10</sub> constitute the factor II and it accounts for 11.74 per cent of the total variance. The variables X<sub>6</sub> and X<sub>7</sub> constitute the factor III and it accounts for 10.60 per cent of the total variance. The variables X<sub>1</sub> and X<sub>2</sub> constitute the factor IV and it accounts for 9.42 per cent of the total variance. The variables X<sub>9</sub> constitute the factor V and it accounts for 7.72 per cent of the total variance.

**Table 8: Summary of Rotation Factor Analysis and Reliability Test Level of Satisfaction Towards Products Attributes and the Dealer Performance**

Factors	Factor Interpretation	Variables Included in the Factors	Cronbach's Alpha
F <sub>1</sub>	Highly Satisfied	Driving Comfort, Safety and enjoyment and Interior(Exotic colours, legroom, seat design, arm rest, music system)	.784
F <sub>2</sub>	Satisfied	Exterior( Overall look, colour, shape, etc) and Vehicle Performance(Pickup, mileage, acceleration, max speed, torque, Engine Capacity)	.661
F <sub>3</sub>	Neutral	Space and Technology	.579
F <sub>4</sub>	Dissatisfied	Price and Quality(Durability, Reliability)	.546

F <sub>5</sub>	Highly Dissatisfied	Fuel Efficiency	.456
----------------	---------------------	-----------------	------

Source: Computed From Primary Data

Factor analysis was used to find out the association between the level of satisfaction towards products attributes and the dealer performance. The Cronbach's reliability values (.784,.661,.579,.546 and.456) indicate significant correlation in association between the level of satisfaction towards products attributes and the dealer performance.

**Table 9: Consumers' Opinion on Problems or Difficulties Faced with the Car Purchased**

Sl. No	Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1.	Faced Issues	246	34.17
2.	Did Not Face Issue	474	65.83
	<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

From the above empirical data analysis it has been observed that 65.83 per cent of respondents have said that did not face any difficulties/ problems with the car they purchased. Batch of 34.17 per cent of respondents have said that they faced certain difficulties or problems in the vehicle they purchased.

From the above data discussion it has been observed that 65.83 per cent of respondents have said that did not faced any difficulties/ problems with the car they purchased.

**Table 10: Consumers' Opinion on Nature of Problems or Difficulties Faced with the Car Purchased**

Sl. No	Variable	No. of Respondents N=(246)	Proportionate Percentage
1.	Acceleration Delay	124	17.22
2.	Unstable Power Steering	125	17.36
3.	Water Pump Failure/ Water Leaking into the Interior	147	20.42
4.	Pickup Problem	147	20.42
5.	Lack of Comfort in Driving	132	18.33
6.	Excessive oil Consumption	125	17.36
7.	Inadequate Legroom Facility	126	17.50
8.	No Road Clearance / Ground Clearance	101	14.03
9.	Electric Problems Lead to Light Failure	87	12.08
10.	Battery Problems	61	8.47
11.	Others	38	5.28

Source: Primary Data

The above table clearly indicates that, 20.42 per cent of respondents have faced pickup problem and water pump failure/ water leaking into the interior. Followed by 18.33 per cent of respondents have said discomfort in driving. Further it has been observed that 17.50 per cent of respondents have claimed issues of inadequate legroom facility. Further it has been observed that 17.36 per cent of respondents have claimed that their vehicle consumes excessive oil and the same number of respondents have marked about the problem of unstable power steering and Batch of respondents have said that they face problem in their vehicles like: delay of acceleration (17.22), poor Road clearance / Ground clearance (14.03), electric problems like light failure(12.08), battery problems(8.47) and others issues too (5.28) respectively.



**Table 11: Consumers' Opinion on Problems Faced at the Dealers Service Centres**

Sl. No	Option	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1.	Faced Issues	203	28.19
2.	Did Not Face Issue	517	71.81
	<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

The above table indicates that 71.81 per cent of respondents have said that they did not face any issues while availing services at dealers' centres. Whereas, 28.19 per cent of sample subjects have faced problem while availing services at the dealers centres service.

It is evident from the data analysis that majority i.e., 71.81 per cent of respondents have said that they did not face issues while availing services at dealers' centres.

**Table 12: Nature of Problems Experienced by the Consumers at the Dealers Centres After Sales Service**

Sl. No	Variable	No. of Respondents N=1053	Proportionate Percentage
1.	Dealer Points and Service Points are not Easily Accessible	111	15.42
2.	Improper Attention for Services in the Service Area	111	15.42
3.	Charging Service Rate More than Initially Agreed	126	17.50
4.	Replacing a Spare Part Instead of Attempting to Repair the Same	110	15.28
5.	High Cost for Replacing Spare Parts	140	19.44
6.	Non- Reliability of Service	95	13.19
7.	Poor Quality of Service	91	12.64
8.	No Prompt Delivery of Vehicles after Each Service	97	13.47
9.	Ignoring the Customer Waiting time on Both Arrival and Delivery of Service.	82	11.39
10.	High Cost of Labours	90	12.50

Source: Primary Data

The above table indicates that 19.44 per cent of respondents have said that they face problems due to heavy cost of spares at the dealers' service centres. Followed by 17.50 per cent of respondents have said the service charging are more than initial agreement at the dealers service centre. Further it has been inferred that 30.84 per cent of sample populations have claimed that they face problems due to inaccessibility of dealer repair centres (15.42 per cent) and they inattentive behaviour (15.42 per cent) irritates them a lot. Batch of 15.28 per cent of respondents have said that their dealers usually replaces spare parts instead of attempting or repairing the cars if there is any problem and 13.47 per cent of respondents claim complaints on the delivery of vehicle after each service. Batch of 13.19 percent of respondents claimed that there is no reliability in the service provided. Batch of 12.64 per cent of respondents claim dissatisfaction with the poor quality of service offered by the dealers at the service centres and 12.50per cent of respondents have said that the cost of labour as high and remaining that 11.39 per cent of respondents have said that they have to wait a long time for both arrival and delivery vehicle from dealers service points.

Hence it has been clearly identified that 19.44 per cent of respondents have said that they face problems due to heavy cost of spares at the dealers' service centres.

## KEY FINDINGS

While coming to the key findings of the study, it has been found that consumers are highly satisfied with the product attributes such as Driving Comfort, Safety and enjoyment and Interior(Exotic colours, legroom, seat design, arm rest, music system). But an alarming issue found was the Fuel efficiency of the vehicle, where most of the consumers are highly dissatisfied. While studying the problems with the usage of the cars it has been found that vehicle pick-up problem was the frequently faced problem by the consumers. Regarding the problems faced at the dealers point the consumers have opined that they can't afford to the cost of replacing spares at the time of servicing their vehicle.

## SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

From the study it has been suggested and concluded that if we want to look at the consumer buying behaviour of the 21st century, we have to acknowledge that consumerism is playing a major role in their decision making. Once if consumers are felt satisfied, they are getting used to their regular brands and they hardly shift from their brands. In all stages of life, humans are customers of one company or another. And they keep having more requirements and needs which have to be fulfilled. These requirements may be low involvement ones, or high involvement ones but they need to be satisfied. Unless their satisfaction is cared and given importance, manufacturers can't look for a loyal customer.

## REFERENCES

1. V. Sridevi (2013) - *A Study on Consumer Satisfaction of Hyundai Car Users with Special Reference to Coimbatore City-M.Phil. Dissertation*
2. Mahapatra, Kumar and Chauhan (2010) - *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences* ISSN: 2278-6236 Vol. 2, No. 4, April 2013 IJARMSS – 72
3. Rajnish Katarne, and Satyendra Sharma, —*Measurement of Service Quality of an Automobile Service Centre, Proceedings of the 2010 International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Dhaka, Bangladesh, January 2010 pp. 9 and 10.*